arXiv:1410.6839v1 [math.GR] 24 Oct 2014

On $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroups of a finite group*†

Lijun Huo, Xiaoyu Chen‡, Wenbin Guo

Department of Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China,

Hefei, Anhui 230026, P. R. China

e-mails: ljhuo@mail.ustc.edu.cn, jelly@mail.ustc.edu.cn, wbguo@ustc.edu.cn

Abstract

A subgroup H of a finite group G is said to be an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists a normal subgroup T of G such that $G = HT$ and $H^g \cap N_T(H) \leq H$ for all $g \in G$. In this paper, we investigate the structure of a finite group G under the assumption that certain subgroups of G of arbitrary prime power order are $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroups of G.

Key words: $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups; $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroups; p-nilpotent group; nilpotent group; supersolvable group.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, all groups considered are finite. G always denotes a group, p denotes a prime, and $|G|_p$ denotes the order of Sylow p-subgroups of G. A class of groups $\mathfrak{F}$ is called a formation if $\mathfrak{F}$ is closed under taking homomorphic images and subdirect products. A formation $\mathfrak{F}$ is said to be saturated if $G \in \mathfrak{F}$ whenever $G/\Phi(G) \in \mathfrak{F}$. All unexplained notation and terminology are standard, as in [7, 10, 12].

Recall that a subgroup H of G is said to be an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G if $H^g \cap N_G(H) \leq H$ for all $g \in G$. This concept was introduced by Goldschmidt in [9] and Bianchi et al. in [5]. It is easy to see that normal subgroups, Sylow subgroups and self-normalizing subgroups of G are all $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups of G. Csörgö, Herzog [6] and Asaad [1] further investigated the influence of $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups on the structure of a finite group.

*This manuscript was finished in August 2013.

†Research is supported by a NNSF grant of China (Grant 11371335) and Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China(Grant 20113402110036).

‡Corresponding author.

2000 AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 20D10, 20D20.

Besides, Y. Wang [20] introduced the concept of c-normal subgroups. A subgroup H of G is said to be c-normal in G if there exists a normal subgroup K of G such that $G = HK$ and $H \cap K \leq H_G$, where H_G is the largest normal subgroup of G contained in H. The properties of c-normal subgroups have been studied by many authors, see for example, [3, 4, 14, 15].

Recently, some attempts were made to give a generalization of both c-normal subgroups and $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups. In [2], M. Asaad et al. introduced the concept of weakly $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups: a subgroup H of G is called an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists a normal subgroup T of G such that $G = HT$ and $H \cap T$ is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. Meanwhile, X. Wei and X. Guo [21] introduced the concept of $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroups: a subgroup H of G is said to be an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists a normal subgroup T of G such that $G = HT$ and $H^g \cap N_T(H) \leq H$ for all $g \in G$. It is easy to see that every weakly $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G.

In [21], the authors gave some conditions on maximal subgroups or minimal subgroups of Sylow subgroups, which are sufficient to guarantee a group to be p-nilpotent or supersolvable. In this paper, we continue to investigate the structure of a group G under the assumption that certain subgroups of G of arbitrary prime power order are $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroups of G. New characterizations of some classes of finite groups are obtained.

2 Preliminaries

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G.*

(1) ([5, Theorem 6(2)]) *If H is subnormal in G, then H is normal in G.*

(2) ([5, Lemma 7(2)]) *If $H \leq K \leq G$, then H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of K.*

(3) ([5, Lemma 2(1)]) *If $N \leq H$ and $N \trianglelefteq G$, then H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G if and only if H/N is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G/N.*

(4) ([5, Theorem 6(3)]) *If $N \trianglelefteq G$ and $N \leq N_G(H)$, then $N_G(HN) = N_G(H)$ and HN is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let H and K be subgroups of G, and $N \trianglelefteq G$.*

(1) ([21, Lemma 2.3(1)]) *If $H \leq K$ and H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G, then H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of K.*

(2) ([21, Lemma 2.3(2)]) *If $N \leq H$, then H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if and only if H/N is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G/N.*

(3) ([21, Lemma 2.4]) *If H is a p-group with $(p, |N|) = 1$ and H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G, then HN is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G and HN/N is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G/N.*

Lemma 2.3. [21, Theorem 3.7] *Let p be the smallest prime dividing $|G|$ and let P be a Sylow p-subgroup of G. Then G is p-nilpotent if every maximal subgroup of P is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G.*

Lemma 2.4. [9, Corollary B3] *Suppose that S is a 2-subgroup of G such that S is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G and $N_G(S)/C_G(S)$ is a 2-group. Then S is a Sylow 2-subgroup of S^G.*

Lemma 2.5. [16, Theorem 1] *Let P be a Sylow p-subgroup of G. Then the following two statements are true:*

(1) *If p is odd and every minimal subgroup of P lies in $Z(N_G(P))$, then G is p-nilpotent.*

(2) *If $p = 2$ and every cyclic subgroup of P of order 2 or 4 is quasinormal in $N_G(P)$, then G is 2-nilpotent.*

Let $F^*(G)$ denote the generalized Fitting subgroup of G, that is, the largest normal quasinilpotent subgroup of G. The following basic facts can be found in [13, Chapter X].

Lemma 2.6. (1) *If N is a normal subgroup of G, then $F^*(N) = N \cap F^*(G)$.*

(2) *$F(G) \leq F^*(G) = F^*(F^*(G))$. If $F^*(G)$ is solvable, then $F^*(G) = F(G)$.*

(3) *$C_G(F^*(G)) \leq F(G)$.*

(4) *If $G > 1$, then $F^*(G) > 1$. In fact, $F^*(G)/F(G) = soc(F(G)C_G(F(G))/F(G))$.*

Lemma 2.7. [21, Lemma 2.5] *Let K be a normal subgroup of G and let H be a normal subgroup of K. If H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G, then H is c-normal in G.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let H be a p-subgroup of G. If H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G and H is not an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G, then G has a normal subgroup M such that $|G : M| = p$ and $G = HM$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, G has a normal subgroup T such that $G = HT$ and $H^g \cap N_T(H) \leq H$ for all $g \in G$. Since H is not an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G, we have that $T < G$. Hence G/T is a p-group, and so G has a normal subgroup M containing T such that $|G : M| = p$ and $G = HM$. □

Lemma 2.9. [11, Lemma 2.9] *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersolvable groups and let G be a group with a normal subgroup E such that $G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. If E is cyclic, then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.*

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersolvable groups. Suppose that M is a subgroup of G such that $|G : M| = p$, $F(G) \not\leq M$ and $M \in \mathfrak{F}$. Then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. If $\Phi(G) > 1$, then it is easy to see that $G/\Phi(G)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the lemma, and so $G/\Phi(G) \in \mathfrak{F}$ by induction. This implies that $G \in \mathfrak{F}$. We may, therefore, assume that $\Phi(G) = 1$. Then $F(G) = N_1 \times N_2 \cdots \times N_t$, where N_i $(i = 1, ..., t)$ is a solvable minimal normal subgroup of G. Since $F(G) \not\leq M$, there exists a solvable minimal normal subgroup N_i of G such that $N_i \not\leq M$. Then clearly, $G = N_iM$, and so $N_i \cap M = 1$. Therefore, $|N_i| = |G : M| = p$ and $G/N_i \cong M \in \mathfrak{F}$. It follows from Lemma 2.9 that $G \in \mathfrak{F}$. □

Lemma 2.11. *Let H be an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. If $L/\Phi(L)$ is a chief factor of G and $H \leq L$, then H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G.*

Proof. By hypothesis, there exists a normal subgroup T of G such that $G = HT$ and $H^g \cap N_T(H) \leq H$ for all $g \in G$. Since $L/\Phi(L)$ is a chief factor of G, either $(L \cap T)\Phi(L)/\Phi(L) = 1$ or $(N \cap T)\Phi(L)/\Phi(L) = L/\Phi(L)$. In the former case, $L = H(L \cap T) = H$. This implies that $H \trianglelefteq G$, and so H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. In the latter case, $(L \cap T)\Phi(L) = L$, and so $T = G$. This also implies that H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. □

Lemma 2.12. [18, Lemma 2.8] *Let P be a normal p-subgroup of G contained in $Z_\infty(G)$. Then $O^p(G) \leq C_G(P)$.*

Lemma 2.13. [8, Lemma 2.4] *Let P be a p-group. If α is a p'-automorphism of P which centralizes $\Omega_1(P)$, then $\alpha = 1$ unless P is a non-abelian 2-group. If $[\alpha, \Omega_2(P)] = 1$, then $\alpha = 1$ without restriction.*

3 Main results

Theorem 3.1. *Let p be the smallest prime divisor of $|G|$ and let P be a Sylow p-subgroup of G. Suppose that P is cyclic or P has a subgroup D with $1 < |D| < |P|$ such that every subgroup H of P of order $|D|$ is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. When $p = 2$ and $|P : D| > 2$, suppose further that H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$ and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4. Then G is p-nilpotent.*

Proof. Suppose that the result is false and let G be a counterexample of minimal order. Then we proceed via the following steps.

(1) P is not cyclic and $|P : D| > p$.

If P is cyclic, then by [19, (10.1.9)], G is p-nilpotent, a contradiction. Suppose that $|P : D| = p$. Then every maximal subgroup of P is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. Hence by Lemma 2.3, G is p-nilpotent, also a contradiction.

(2) Every proper subgroup of G containing P is p-nilpotent.

Let V be any proper subgroup of G containing P. Then by Lemma 2.2(1), V satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. By the choice of G, V is p-nilpotent. Thus (2) follows.

(3) $O_{p'}(G) = 1$.

If not, then by Lemma 2.2(3), $G/O_{p'}(G)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. By the choice of G, $G/O_{p'}(G)$ is p-nilpotent, and so G is p-nilpotent, which is impossible.

(4) G is not a non-abelian simple group.

Assume that G is a non-abelian simple group. Then by Feit-Thompson's Theorem, we have that $p = 2$. Let H be a subgroup of P of order $|D|$. Then clearly, H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. Hence by Lemma 2.1(2), H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of P, and thus $H \trianglelefteq P$ by Lemma 2.1(1). It follows from (2) that $N_G(H)$ is 2-nilpotent for $H \ntrianglelefteq G$, and so $N_G(H)/C_G(H)$ is a 2-group. By Lemma 2.4, H is a Sylow 2-subgroup of G, a contradiction. Therefore, G is not a non-abelian simple group.

(5) $O_p(G) > 1$, and every proper normal subgroup of G is contained in $O_p(G)$.

Let L be a proper normal subgroup of G. Then we only need to prove that L is a p-group. By (3), $p \mid |L|$. If $|L|_p > |D|$, then L satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem by Lemma 2.2(1). Hence L is p-nilpotent due to the choice of G. It follows from (3) that L is a p-group. Now consider that $|L|_p \leq |D|$. Then there exists a normal subgroup K of P such that $P \cap L \leq K$ and $|K| = p|D|$. This induces that $|LK|_p = |K| = p|D|$, and so K is a Sylow p-subgroup of LK. If $LK = G$, then $|P| = |K| = p|D|$, which contradicts (1). Thus $LK < G$. By Lemma 2.2(1), LK satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. Then by the choice of G, LK is p-nilpotent, and so is L. Hence L is a p-group by (3), and consequently (5) holds.

(6) Every $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G contained in P is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G.

Let V be any $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G contained in P. Then there exists a normal subgroup T of G such that $G = VT$ and $V^g \cap N_T(V) \leq V$ for all $g \in G$. By (5), since G is not a p-group, we have that $T = G$. Therefore, V is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G.

(7) Let N be a minimal normal subgroup of G contained in $O_p(G)$. Then $|N| \leq |D|$ and G/N is p-nilpotent.

If $|N| > |D|$, then there exists a subgroup H of N of order $|D|$ such that H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G by (6). It follows from Lemma 2.1(1) that H is normal in G, which is impossible. Hence $|N| \leq |D|$. First suppose that $|N| < |D|$. Then by (6) and Lemma 2.1(3), G/N satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. By the choice of G, G/N is p-nilpotent.

Now consider that $|N| = |D|$. We claim that every cyclic subgroup of P/N of order prime or 4 (when $p = 2$) is normal in $N_G(P)/N$. Let X/N be a subgroup of P/N of order p. If $N \leq \Phi(X)$, then X is cyclic, and so is N. This implies that $|N| = |D| = p$. Then by (6), every cyclic subgroup of P of order p or 4 (when $p = 2$) is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. By Lemmas 2.1(1) and 2.1(2), every cyclic subgroup of P of order p or 4 (when $p = 2$) is normal in $N_G(P)$. Since p is the smallest prime divisor of $|G|$, every minimal subgroup of P lies in $Z(N_G(P))$. Hence by Lemma 2.5, G is p-nilpotent, a contradiction. Thus $N \nleq \Phi(X)$, and so X has a maximal subgroup S such that $X = SN$. Since $|S| = |N| = |D|$, S is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G by (6). By Lemmas 2.1(1) and 2.1(2), $S \trianglelefteq N_G(P)$, and thus $X/N = SN/N \trianglelefteq N_G(P)/N$. This shows that the claim holds when p is odd. Consider that $p = 2$. Then by (1), $|P : D| > 2$. Let Y/N be a cyclic subgroup of P/N of order 4. If $N \leq \Phi(Y)$, then Y is cyclic. This implies that $|N| = |D| = 2$, a contradiction. Thus $N \nleq \Phi(Y)$, and

so Y has a maximal subgroup U such that $Y = UN$. Clearly, $|U| = 2|D|$. Since $U/U \cap N \cong Y/N$ is a cyclic group of order 4, by hypothesis and (6), U is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. A similar discussion as above shows that $Y/N = UN/N \trianglelefteq N_G(P)/N$. Hence the claim holds when $p = 2$. Since p is the smallest prime divisor of $|G|$, every minimal subgroup of P/N lies in $Z(N_G(P)/N)$. Therefore, G/N is p-nilpotent by Lemma 2.5.

(8) Final contradiction.

By (7), G/N is p-nilpotent. Then G has a normal subgroup M of G such that $|G : M| = p$. By (1), $|M|_p > |D|$. Then by (6) and Lemma 2.1(2), M satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. Hence M is p-nilpotent due to the choice of G, and so G is p-nilpotent. The final contradiction completes the proof. □

The following corollary can be deduced immediately from Lemma 2.2(3) and Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that every noncyclic Sylow subgroup P (if exists) of G has a subgroup D such that $1 < |D| < |P|$ and every subgroup H of P of order $|D|$ is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. When P is a Sylow 2-subgroup of G and $|P : D| > 2$, suppose further that H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$ and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4. Then G has a Sylow tower of supersolvable type.*

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersolvable groups and let G be a group with a normal subgroup E such that $G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. Suppose that every noncyclic Sylow subgroup P (if exists) of $F^*(E)$ has a subgroup D such that $1 < |D| < |P|$ and every subgroup H of P of order $|D|$ is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. When P is a Sylow 2-subgroup of $F^*(E)$ and $|P : D| > 2$, suppose further that H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$ and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4. Then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose that the result is false and let (G, E) be a counterexample such that $|G| + |E|$ is minimal. Then we proceed via the following steps.

(1) $F^*(E) = F(E)$.

By Lemma 2.2(1) and Corollary 3.2, $F^*(E)$ has a Sylow tower of supersolvable type, and so $F^*(E)$ is solvable. It follows from Lemma 2.6(2) that $F^*(E) = F(E)$.

(2) There exist a noncyclic Sylow p-subgroup P of $F(E)$ and a subgroup H of P of order $|D|$ or $2|D|$ (when $p = 2$, and there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$ and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4) such that $|P : D| > p$ and H is not an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G.

Suppose that for every prime divisor p of $|F(E)|$ and every noncyclic Sylow p-subgroup P of $F(E)$, either $|P : D| = p$ or all subgroups H of P of order $|D|$ or $2|D|$ (when $p = 2$, $|P : D| > 2$ and there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$

and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4) are $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups of G. In the former case, by Lemma 2.7, all subgroups H of P of order $|D|$ are c-normal in G. In the latter case, by Lemma 2.1(1), all subgroups H of P of order $|D|$ or $2|D|$ (when $p = 2$, $|P : D| > 2$ and there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$ and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4) are normal in G. Hence by [17, Theorem 1.4], $G \in \mathfrak{F}$, a contradiction. Thus (2) holds.

(3) Final contradiction.

By hypothesis and (2), H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G and H is not an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. Hence G has a normal subgroup M such that $|G : M| = p$ and $G = HM$ by Lemma 2.8. Since $G = HM = EM$, we have that $M/E \cap M \cong G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. By Lemma 2.6(1), $F^*(E \cap M) = F^*(E) \cap M = F(E) \cap M$. Note that $|F(E) : F(E) \cap M| = |G : M| = p$ and $|F(E) \cap M|_p > |D|$ by (2). Then clearly, $(M, E \cap M)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem by Lemma 2.2(1). By the choice of (G, E), $M \in \mathfrak{F}$. It follows from Lemma 2.10 that $G \in \mathfrak{F}$. The final contradiction completes the proof. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a saturated formation containing all supersolvable groups and let G be a group with a normal subgroup E such that $G/E \in \mathfrak{F}$. Suppose that every noncyclic Sylow subgroup P (if exists) of E has a subgroup D such that $1 < |D| < |P|$ and every subgroup H of P of order $|D|$ is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. When P is a Sylow 2-subgroup of E and $|P : D| > 2$, suppose further that H is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G if there exists $D_1 \trianglelefteq H \leq P$ such that $2|D_1| = |D|$ and H/D_1 is a cyclic group of order 4. Then $G \in \mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose that the result is false and let (G, E) be a counterexample such that $|G|+|E|$ is minimal. By Lemma 2.2(1) and Corollary 3.2, we see that E has a Sylow tower of supersolvable type. Without loss of generality, let p be the largest prime divisor of $|E|$. Then $P \trianglelefteq G$. By Lemma 2.2(3), $(G/P, E/P)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. Then the choice of (G, E) implies that $G/P \in \mathfrak{F}$. Hence (G, P) satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 3.3, and so $G \in \mathfrak{F}$. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let E be a normal subgroup of G such that G/E is nilpotent. Suppose that every minimal subgroup of E is contained in $Z_\infty(G)$, and every cyclic subgroup of E of order 4 is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. Then G is nilpotent.*

Proof. Assume that the result is false and let (G, E) be a counterexample such that $|G| + |E|$ is minimal. Then we prove the theorem via the following steps.

(1) G is a minimal nonnilpotent group, that is, $G = P \rtimes Q$, where P is a normal Sylow p-subgroup of G and Q is a nonnormal cyclic Sylow q-subgroup of G for some prime $q \neq p$; $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G; $exp(P) = p$ when $p > 2$ and $exp(P)$ is at most 4 when $p = 2$.

Let K be any proper subgroup of G. Then $K/E \cap K \cong EK/E \leq G/E$ is nilpotent, and every minimal subgroup of $E \cap K$ is contained in $Z_\infty(G) \cap K \leq Z_\infty(K)$.

By hypothesis, every cyclic subgroup of $E \cap K$ of order 4 is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. Thus by Lemma 2.2(1), every cyclic subgroup of $E \cap K$ of order 4 is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of K. Hence $(K, E \cap K)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. Then the choice of (G, E) implies that K is nilpotent. Hence G is a minimal nonnilpotent group, and so (1) holds by [12, Chapter III, Satz 5.2].

(2) $P \leq E$.

If not, then $P \cap E < P$, and so $(P \cap E)Q < G$. By (1), $(P \cap E)Q$ is nilpotent. This implies that $Q \trianglelefteq (P \cap E)Q$. Since $G/P \cap E \lesssim G/P \times G/E$ is nilpotent, $(P \cap E)Q \trianglelefteq G$, and thus $Q \trianglelefteq G$, a contradiction.

(3) Final contradiction.

If $exp(P) = p$, then $P \leq Z_\infty(G)$, and so G is nilpotent, which is impossible. Hence we may assume that $p = 2$ and $exp(P) = 4$. Then by Lemma 2.11, every cyclic subgroup of P of order 4 is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G, and so every cyclic subgroup of P of order 4 is normal in G by Lemma 2.1(1). Take an element $x \in P \backslash \Phi(P)$. Since $P/\Phi(P)$ is a chief factor of G, $P = \langle x \rangle^G \Phi(P) = \langle x \rangle^G$. If x is of order 2, then $P = \langle x \rangle^G \leq Z_\infty(G)$, a contradiction. Now assume that x is of order 4. Then $\langle x \rangle \trianglelefteq G$, and so $P = \langle x \rangle$ is cyclic. By [19, (10.1.9)], G is 2-nilpotent, and so $Q \trianglelefteq G$. This is the final contradiction. □

Theorem 3.6. *Let E be a normal subgroup of G such that G/E is nilpotent. Suppose that every minimal subgroup of $F^*(E)$ is contained in $Z_\infty(G)$, and every cyclic subgroup of $F^*(E)$ of order 4 is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. Then G is nilpotent.*

Proof. Assume that the result is false and let (G, E) be a counterexample such that $|G| + |E|$ is minimal. Then we prove the theorem via the following steps.

(1) Every proper normal subgroup of G is nilpotent.

Let K be any proper normal subgroup of G. Then $K/E \cap K \cong EK/E \leq G/E$ is nilpotent. By Lemma 2.6(1), $F^*(E \cap K) = F^*(E) \cap K$. Hence by Lemma 2.2(1), $(K, E \cap K)$ satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem. The the choice of (G, E) implies that K is nilpotent.

(2) $E = G = \gamma_\infty(G)$ and $F^*(G) = F(G) < G$, where $\gamma_\infty(G)$ is the nilpotent residual of G.

If $E < G$, then E is nilpotent by (1), and so $F^*(E) = F(E) = E$. By Theorem 3.5, G is nilpotent, a contradiction. Thus $E = G$. Now suppose that $F^*(G) = G$. Then by Theorem 3.5 again, G is nilpotent, which is impossible. Hence $F^*(G) < G$, and $F^*(G) = F(G)$ by (1). If $\gamma_\infty(G) < G$, then by (1), $\gamma_\infty(G) \leq F(G)$, and so $G/F(G)$ is nilpotent. It follows from Theorem 3.5 that G is nilpotent, a contradiction. Thus $\gamma_\infty(G) = G$.

(3) every cyclic subgroup of $F(G)$ of order 4 is contained in $Z(G)$.

By hypothesis and (2), every cyclic subgroup H of $F(G)$ of order 4 is an $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroup of G. Then there exists a normal subgroup T of G such that $G = HT$

and $H^g \cap N_T(H) \leq H$ for all $g \in G$. If $T < G$, then $T \leq F(G)$ by (1), and thereby $F(G) = G$, a contradiction. Hence $T = G$, and so H is an $\mathscr{H}$-subgroup of G. By Lemma 2.1(1), $H \trianglelefteq G$. This implies that $G/C_G(H)$ is abelian. Then by (2), $C_G(H) = \gamma_\infty(G) = G$, and so $H \leq Z(G)$. Thus (3) holds.

(4) Final contradiction.

Let p be any prime divisor of $|F(G)|$ and let P be the Sylow p-subgroup of $F(G)$. Then $P \trianglelefteq G$. If p is odd, then by hypothesis, $\Omega_1(P) \leq Z_\infty(G)$. It follows from Lemma 2.12 that $O^p(G) \leq C_G(\Omega_1(P))$, and so $O^p(G) \leq C_G(P)$ by Lemma 2.13. Then by (2), $C_G(P) = \gamma_\infty(G) = G$. Now consider that $p = 2$. Then by hypothesis and (3), $\Omega_2(P) \leq Z_\infty(G)$. A similar discussion as above also shows that $C_G(P) = G$. Therefore, we have that $C_G(F(G)) = G$, which contradicts the fact that $C_G(F(G)) \leq F(G)$ by (2) and Lemma 2.6(3). The proof is thus completed. □

References

[1] M. Asaad, On p-nilpotence and supersolvability of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **34** (2006), 189–195.

[2] M. Asaad, A. A. Heliel, M. M. Al-Mosa Al-Shomrani, On weakly $\mathscr{H}$-subgroups of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **40** (2012), 3540–3550.

[3] M. Asaad, M. E. Mohamed, On c-normality of finite groups, J. Aust. Math. Soc., **78** (2005), 297–304.

[4] A. Ballester-Bolinches, Y. Wang, Finite groups with some C-normal minimal subgroups, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **153** (2000), 121–127.

[5] M. Bianchi, A. Gillio Berta Mauri, M. Herzog, L. Verardi, On finite solvable groups in which normality is a transitive relation, J. Group Theory, **3** (2000), 147–156.

[6] P. Csörgö, M. Herzog, On supersolvable groups and the nilpotator, Comm. Algebra, **32** (2004), 609–620.

[7] K. Doerk, T. Hawkes, Finite Soluble Groups, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

[8] T. M. Gagen, Topics in Finite Groups, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1976.

[9] D. M. Goldschmidt, Strongly closed 2-subgroups of finite groups, Ann. of Math., **102** (1975), 475–489.

[10] W. Guo, The Theory of Classes of Groups, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.

[11] W. Guo, A. N. Skiba, Finite groups with given s-embedded and n-embedded subgroups, J. Algebra, **321** (2009), 2843–2860.

[12] B. Huppert, Endliche Gruppen I, Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1967.

[13] B. Huppert, Blackburn N, Finite Groups III, Berlin–New York, Springer-Verlag, 1982.

[14] J. J. Jaraden, A. N. Skiba, On c-normal subgroups of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **35** (2007), 3776–3788.

[15] D. Li, X. Guo, The influence of c-normality of subgroups on the structure of finite groups, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **150** (2000), 53–60.

[16] S. Li, On minimal subgroups of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **22** (1994), 1913–1918.

[17] Y. Li, S. Qiao, Y. Wang, On weakly s-permutably embedded subgroups of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **37** (2009), 1086–1097.

[18] Y. Li, Y. Wang, On π-quasinormally embedded subgroups of finite group, J. Algebra, **281** (2004), 109–123.

[19] D. J. S. Robinson, A Course in the Theory of Groups, New York, Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[20] Y. Wang, C-normality of groups and its properties, J. Algebra, **180** (1996), 954–965.

[21] X. Wei, X. Guo, On $\mathscr{H}C$-subgroups and the structure of finite groups, Comm. Algebra, **40** (2012), 3245–3256.